



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/594,152

09/25/2006

Hideomi Koinuma

063111

6075

38834

7590

05/14/2008

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

HO, ANTHONY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/594,152	Applicant(s) KOINUMA ET AL.	
	Examiner ANTHONY HO	Art Unit 2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment to application no. 10/594,152 filed on March 18, 2008.

Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Claims 11-20 stand withdrawn.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 6, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shi et al (US Patent 6,326,640).

Shi et al discloses a transistor with a buffer layer (24) and an organic thin film (23) sequentially deposited (*in this case, the specific sequential order is not claimed*) on a substrate, wherein said buffer layer comprises acene system aromatics (Figure 2; column 3 – column 5).

The recitation “said buffer layer accelerates two dimensional growth of said organic thin film, and orients said organic thin film flatly” in the claim is functional language and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, the device must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board’s finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference. See MPEP 2114.

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kelley et al (US Patent 6,433,359).

In re claims 1 and 6, Kelley et al discloses a transistor with a buffer layer (16) and an organic thin film (18) sequentially deposited on a substrate; wherein said buffer layer

comprises acene system aromatics (*since applicants have not specifically defined what constitutes an acene system aromatics, any of the listed materials in column 6 of Kelley et al meets the limitation of an acene system aromatic*) (Figure 1; column 3 – column 7).

The recitation “said buffer layer accelerates two dimensional growth of said organic thin film, and orients said organic thin film flatly” in the claim is functional language and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, the device must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board’s finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference. See MPEP 2114.

In re claims 2 and 7, Kelley discloses a thin layer (14) between the substrate (26) and the buffer layer (Figure 1; column 3 – column 7).

The recitation “characterized in that a layer easily oriented with said buffer layer” in the claim is functional language and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, the device must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board’s finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference. See MPEP 2114.

In re claims 3, 8 and 21-24, Kelley et al discloses the substrate is an insulating substrate and the buffer layer and organic thin film comprises one of the listed materials (column 3 – column 7).

Claims 1, 6, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Dimitrakopoulos et al (US PUB 2004/0161873).

Dimitrakopoulos et al discloses a transistor with a buffer layer (18) and an organic thin film (16) sequentially deposited on a substrate (10); wherein said buffer layer comprises acene system aromatics (see Figure 5) (Figures 2-3; paragraph 0046 – paragraph 0059).

The recitation “said buffer layer accelerates two dimensional growth of said organic thin film, and orients said organic thin film flatly” in the claim is functional language and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, the device must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board’s finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference. See MPEP 2114.

Furthermore, the claimed invention is a product-by-process claim and even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of

patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 2-3 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al (US Patent 6,326,640) as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Hirai (US PUB 2003/0160235).

In re claims 2 and 7, Hirai discloses a thin layer (S',D') between the substrate (1) and the buffer layer (Figures 5(a) – Figure 5(c); paragraph 0095 – paragraph 0116).

The advantage is to decrease the cost of manufacturing a semiconductor device (paragraph 0003 – paragraph 0005).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the transistor as taught by Shi et al with a thin layer between the substrate and the buffer layer as taught by Hirai in order to decrease the cost of manufacturing a semiconductor device.

In re claims 3 and 8, Hirai discloses the substrate is an insulating substrate and the organic thin film comprises one of the listed materials (paragraph 0095 – paragraph 0116).

The advantage is to decrease the cost of manufacturing a semiconductor device (paragraph 0003 – paragraph 0005).

Therefore, it would have it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the transistor as taught by Shi et al with the substrate is an insulating substrate and the buffer layer and organic thin film comprises one of the listed materials as taught by Hirai in order to decrease the cost of manufacturing a semiconductor device.

Claims 4-5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al (US Patent 6,326,640) in view of Hirai (US PUB 2003/0160235) as applied to claims 3 and 8 above, and further in view of Afzali-Ardakani et al (US PUB 2004/0183070).

Shi et al discloses the buffer layer (24) comprises pentacene (column 3 – column 5).

Hirai discloses the organic thin film comprises fullerene (paragraph 0097).

The advantage is to decrease the cost of manufacturing a semiconductor device (paragraph 0003 – paragraph 0005).

Afzali-Ardakani et al the substrate (100) is a sapphire substrate (paragraph 0069) (Figure 4a).

The advantage is to avoid using high-temperature or costly, high-vacuum processes to obtain the organic semiconductor devices (paragraph 0023).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the transistor as taught by Shi et al with the

organic thin film comprises fullerene as taught by Hirai and the substrate is a sapphire substrate as taught by Afzali-Ardakani et al in order to decrease the cost of manufacturing and to avoid using high-temperature or costly, high-vacuum processes to obtain the organic semiconductor devices.

Furthermore, the claimed invention is a product-by-process claim and even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claims 3-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley et al (US Patent 6,433,359) as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Afzali-Ardakani et al (US PUB 2004/0183070).

Afzali-Ardakani et al discloses a buffer layer (110) of an organic semiconductor device comprises pentacene (paragraph 0070) and the substrate (100) is a sapphire substrate (paragraph 0069) (Figure 4a).

The advantage is to avoid using high-temperature or costly, high-vacuum processes to obtain the organic semiconductor devices (paragraph 0023).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the transistor as taught by Kelley et al with a

buffer layer of an organic semiconductor device comprises pentacene and the substrate is a sapphire substrate as taught by Afzali-Ardakani et al in order to avoid using high-temperature or costly, high-vacuum processes to obtain the organic semiconductor devices.

Furthermore, the claimed invention is a product-by-process claim and even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley et al (US Patent 6,433,359) in view of Afzali-Ardakani et al (US PUB 2004/0183070).

Kelley et al discloses a transistor with a buffer layer (16) and an organic thin film (18) sequentially deposited on a substrate; wherein said buffer layer comprises acene system aromatics (*since applicants have not specifically defined what constitutes an acene system aromatics, any of the listed materials in column 6 of Kelley et al meets the limitation of an acene system aromatic*) (Figure 1; column 3 – column 7).

The recitation "said buffer layer accelerates two dimensional growth of said organic thin film, and orients said organic thin film flatly" in the claim is functional language and is

treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, the device must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board's finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference. See MPEP 2114.

Afzali-Ardakani et al discloses a buffer layer (110) of an organic semiconductor device comprises pentacene (paragraph 0070) and the substrate (100) is a sapphire substrate (paragraph 0069) (Figure 4a).

The advantage is to avoid using high-temperature or costly, high-vacuum processes to obtain the organic semiconductor devices (paragraph 0023).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the transistor as taught by Hirai with a buffer layer of an organic semiconductor device comprises pentacene and the substrate is a sapphire substrate as taught by Afzali-Ardakani et al in order to avoid using high-temperature or costly, high-vacuum processes to obtain the organic semiconductor devices.

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al (US Patent 6,326,640) in view of Hirai (US PUB 2003/0160235).

Shi et al discloses a transistor with a buffer layer (24) and an organic thin film (23) sequentially deposited (*in this case, the specific sequential order is not claimed*) on a

substrate, wherein said buffer layer comprises acene system aromatics (Figure 2; column 3 – column 5).

The recitation “said buffer layer accelerates two dimensional growth of said organic thin film, and orients said organic thin film flatly” in the claim is functional language and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, the device must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board’s finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference. See MPEP 2114.

Hirai discloses the organic thin film comprises fullerene (paragraph 0097).

The advantage is to decrease the cost of manufacturing a semiconductor device (paragraph 0003 – paragraph 0005).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the transistor as taught by Shi et al with the organic thin film comprises fullerene as taught by Hirai in order to is to decrease the cost of manufacturing a semiconductor device.

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dimitrakopoulos et al (US PUB 2004/0161873) in view of Hirai (US PUB 2003/0160235).

Art Unit: 2815

Dimitrakopoulos et al discloses a transistor with a buffer layer (18) and an organic thin film (16) sequentially deposited on a substrate (10); wherein said buffer layer comprises acene system aromatics (see Figure 5) (Figures 2-3; paragraph 0046 – paragraph 0059).

The recitation “said buffer layer accelerates two dimensional growth of said organic thin film, and orients said organic thin film flatly” in the claim is functional language and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, the device must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board's finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference. See MPEP 2114.

Hirai discloses the organic thin film comprises fullerene (paragraph 0097).

The advantage is to decrease the cost of manufacturing a semiconductor device (paragraph 0003 – paragraph 0005).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the transistor as taught by Dimitrakopoulos et al with the organic thin film comprises fullerene as taught by Hirai in order to is to decrease the cost of manufacturing a semiconductor device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the reference Shi et al have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed March 18, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding the Kelley et al reference, examiner asserts that since applicants have not specifically defined what constitutes an acene system aromatics, any of the listed materials in column 6 of Kelley et al meets the limitation of an acene system aromatic. Thus, the claimed invention is not patentably distinct over the organic transistor of Kelley et al.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2815

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY HO whose telephone number is (571) 270-1432. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 10:30AM-9:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 2815

/Kenneth A Parker/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2815